

Response to First Office Action
Docket No. 020.0336.US.CON

REMARKS

Claims 1-59 are pending. Claims 1 and 11 have been cancelled. Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-15, 17-18, 20, 30, 31, 34-36, 42, 53, and 54 have been amended. Claims 2-10 and 12-59 remain in the application. No new matter has been
5 introduced.

Claims 9, 30, 31, 34, 35, and 36 have been amended to correct antecedent basis and not for reasons relating to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claims 31, 42, and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Claims 31, 42, and 53 have been amended per
10 Examiner's suggestions. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 1-10 of commonly-assigned U.S. Patent No. 6,221,011, issued April 24, 2001. A Terminal Disclaimer is enclosed.
15 Withdrawal of the rejection for double-patenting is respectfully requested.

Claims 51-59 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 23-31 of commonly-assigned U.S. Patent No. 6,277,072, issued August 21, 2001. A Terminal Disclaimer is enclosed. Withdrawal of the rejection for double-patenting is respectfully
20 requested.

Claims 1, 10, 11, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,249,705, issued to Snell. Claims 1 and 11 have been cancelled and the rejection rendered moot. Claim 10 has been amended to depend on allowable Claim 8. Claim 20 has been amended to depend on
25 allowable Claim 18. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-9 and 12-19 stand subject to objection as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claims 8 and 18 have been amended to incorporate the limitations of their base claim. Claims 2-5, 7 and 10 have been amended to
30 depend on allowable Claim 8. Claims 12-15, 17, and 20 have been amended to

Response to First Office Action
Docket No. 020.0336.US.CON

depend on allowable Claim 18. Claims 2-9 and 12-19 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed by the applicant and is considered to be no more pertinent than the prior art references already applied.

Claims 21-30, 32-41, 43-50 are allowed. Claims 2-10, and 12-20 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Entry of the foregoing amendments is requested and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. Please contact the undersigned at (206) 381-3900 regarding any questions or concerns associated with the present matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 22, 2004

By: 

Patrick J.S. Inouye, Esq.
Reg. No. 40,297

Law Offices of Patrick J.S. Inouye
810 Third Avenue, Suite 258
Seattle, WA 98104

Telephone: (206) 381-3900
Facsimile: (206) 381-3999

OA Response

OA Response

- 21 -